

ties to the improvements in the social security system. The same carrot and stick approach will be used in the housing bill, where the accepted programs of FHA financing, college housing and urban renewal comprise the vehicle for a new concept of rent supplements, direct grants for private home rehabilitation and the new cities concept."

The established programs to which new concepts are tied are what Mize calls sweeteners, to make the new concepts seem more acceptable.

Representatives, of course, are concerned primarily with the House. The Senate, however, has a greater problem, Mize said.

"An amendment in the Senate does not have to be germane to the issue as it does in the House," he said. One example was last year when a reapportionment amendment was attached to the foreign aid bill. Recently, a proposal to permit delay of 1964 income tax payments was attached as a rider to the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

Many measures so camouflaged, especially some of the new welfare concepts which are being added to our system with sometimes alarming regularity, probably could not stand on their own feet if they were held up in the light of Congress as separate and distinct bills. It stands to reason that there would be more reluctance to launch new programs when their merits are questionable. But when these issues are tied to programs already on the books, they can often slide through.

Mize points out that the Joint Committee on Congressional Reorganization will begin public hearings next month on ideas to improve the operation of Congress. The committee would do well to study Mize's ideas on omnibus bills.

GUN LAWS—SOUND APPROACH BACKED BY NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION

(Mr. CLEVELAND (at the request of Mr. QUILLEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the National Rifle Association has been wrongfully attacked in some quarters as opposed to all legislation to tighten Federal firearms laws. This is not true. On the contrary, the National Rifle Association is deeply concerned by all questions involving firearms. That is, after all, its reason for existing. The National Rifle Association does recognize the problem and does support sound legislation to restrict the availability of weapons to juveniles and criminals and other irresponsible persons. The Association and millions of other Americans who do not belong to the National Rifle Association do ask, however, that this issue be considered with reason and logic and free of the emotionalism that surrounds a good deal of the debate.

In an editorial published in the May issue of the American Rifleman, the National Rifle Association states its position with forthright clarity. I offer it at this point in the RECORD as a contribution to the discussion on gun legislation. My own position in favor of sound gun legislation but in opposition to the stringent terms of the administration's bill (S. 1592), was set forth in the RECORD of May 4, pages 9102 to 9103.

The editorial follows:

THIS IS OUR STAND

The primary purposes of the National Rifle Association of America, as stated in its constitution and bylaws, are:

"To promote public safety, law and order, and the national defense; to educate and train citizens of good repute in the safe and efficient handling of small arms, and in the technique of design, production and group instruction; to increase the knowledge of small arms on the part of members of law enforcement agencies, of the Armed Forces, and of citizens who would be subject to service in the event of war; and generally to encourage the lawful ownership and use of small arms by citizens of good repute."

In support of these objectives, the National Rifle Association stands squarely on the premise that the ownership of firearms must not be denied American citizens of good repute so long as they use them for lawful purposes.

No other organization does so much to educate our people in safety with firearms, in the home and on the shooting range and in the hunting field. No other organization is so vitally concerned with the training of citizens in the use of the basic weapons of national defense, the individual's personal arm. No other organization so strongly encourages shooting for recreation, in every field and with every type of sporting gun. No other organization does more to promote the rights and responsibilities of reputable citizens who own and use firearms.

For these reasons, the National Rifle Association is vitally concerned with efforts in Congress to amend the Federal Firearms Act to provide Federal control of mail-order guns. Since 1959, investigations and hearings have been conducted by the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary of the U.S. Senate. In its interim report, ordered to be printed on August 7, 1964, will be found the following statements:

"As our investigation progressed, it became apparent that a major source of firearms to juveniles and young adults was the mail-order common carrier route. This process involves the ordering of the firearm by common carrier. Present Federal law prohibits the delivery of a handgun by mail except to firearms dealers.

"An overwhelming majority of the 69 respondents to the questionnaire (law enforcement authorities throughout the United States) indicated support of Federal legislation to place enforceable controls over the interstate transportation of concealable firearms, which enter their jurisdictions for delivery to prospective purchases.

"The need for Federal remedial legislation is apparent. As a general statement, it can be said that all of the witnesses who testified recommended Federal legislation to prevent the shipment and delivery in interstate commerce of mail-order firearms to juveniles under the age of 18 years; that proper safeguards be written into the Federal Firearms Act to preclude shipment of these firearms to convicted felons, narcotic addicts, and chronic lawbreakers; and an increase in the Federal Firearms Act dealers' license fee."

Contrary to claims by the antigun forces, members of the National Rifle Association of America and millions of other law-abiding citizens do not oppose all proposed firearms legislation. They have recognized the problems of some local communities created by the availability of handguns to juveniles, criminals, and irresponsible persons through mail-order purchases. They have supported legislation prepared and proposed by the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency (S. 1975, introduced on Aug. 2, 1963), to establish Federal controls over the transportation of concealable firearms in interstate commerce. They do support properly drawn legislation to outlaw dev-

ices such as bazookas, bombs, and antitank guns. They do support properly drawn legislation to curb the flood of cheap foreign firearms that are being dumped in America. They do support properly drawn legislation to impose heavy penalties for crimes involving the misuse of firearms. They do support the strict enforcement of existing laws at all levels of government.

The National Rifle Association of America supports properly drawn legislation that is proposed to accomplish these purposes, and this is our stand.

TRIBUTE TO HON. JOSEPH MARTIN

(Mr. CONTE (at the request of Mr. QUILLEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, last night in Newton, Mass., I was privileged to attend the seventh annual achievement meeting of the Newton Chamber of Commerce. This meeting was more than another meeting of a local chamber of commerce to honor a local dignitary. It was a testimonial to a man we all know and respect. It was a meeting that tried to express in some way the almost boundless admiration that Massachusetts and the Republican Party has for this man. I am speaking, of course, of Congressman JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., the former Speaker of this House.

I can only speak for myself and express my deep feeling of respect, admiration—yes, even of love—for this outstanding American who for so long has given of himself to this House and to this Nation. Ever since I came to Congress some 7 years ago, and even before, his guidance and counsel has been invaluable—and unrepayable. His example as a Republican and as a Member of Congress has continually guided my actions and my contacts with my colleagues. A few weeks ago in Westfield, Mass., I addressed a group of young students who were participating in a youth conference. The topic of my remarks was "The Public Servant." I do not believe that there can be a better example of a man in the public service than our colleague, Congressman MARTIN.

At this meeting at which Congressman MARTIN received the 1965 Achievement Award, the major address was given by my friend and leader of the Republican Party in Congress, Congressman GERALD FORD. I can only say that I wholly concur in the remarks that Congressman Ford delivered last night. I would like to share them with you and the Members of this House who were not fortunate enough to be able to attend this ceremony in honor of former Speaker JOE MARTIN:

REMARKS BY HON. GERALD R. FORD, AT THE TESTIMONIAL FOR JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., NEWTON, MASS., MAY 24, 1965

Although this is a nonpartisan dinner, I would like to say that I'm particularly pleased to be here because I understand that the city of Newton casts the largest number of Republican votes of any community in Massachusetts. As the leader of the oppressed minority in the House, it's a pleasure to be in such a friendly environment.

While everyone knows that it was Nathan Hale who said, "I regret that I have but one life to give for my country," tonight I would add a modern corollary to that famous

May 25, 1965

statement. It is this: "The Republican Party regrets that it has but one JOE MARTIN to give to our country." All would agree that more Joe Martins would make America even greater.

I feel a special kinship for our guest of honor. JOE MARTIN once said, "the position of minority leader of the House of Representatives is the most thankless job in Washington. I would not take 10 times \$10,000 to return to it." And now I'm fellow who's trying to fill the giant shoes that JOE wore for so long, with such distinction, dedication, and ability.

But JOE MARTIN and I have something else in common. We have both been avid amateur athletes. I was once a fair football player at the University of Michigan, and he was once a very good semipro baseball player.

Many of you may not know that JOE has maintained his contacts with baseball through the years. When the great Washington Senators' pitcher, Walter Johnson, ran for Congress, his friend JOE MARTIN wrote two campaign speeches for him—one to give before labor groups, and the other to give before farmers. Unfortunately Johnson was a better pitcher than politician. He got the two speeches mixed up, delivered the labor speech to farmers and vice versa. Needless to say, he lost the election, which perhaps proves what JOE MARTIN learned a long time ago: It's easier to be a great Washington Senator than a Member of the House of Representatives.

The man we honor tonight has had the most remarkable record of public service of any person currently active on the political scene. So, if he will forgive me, I would like to turn these remarks into my version of "This Is Your Life."

JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., was born on November 3, 1884, the day before Grover Cleveland was elected President for the first time. His father wanted to name him Grover Cleveland Martin. But his mother, a stanch Republican, said, "Grover's a dog's name."

His father was a hard-working North Attleboro blacksmith whose earnings were never more than \$18 a week.

Since the family was poor, young Joe started to work outside of school hours at the age of 6. One of his jobs was to brush the flies off the horses while his father shod them. Another job was as a delivery boy for the North Attleboro Evening Chronicle. (Now probably every newsboy dreams of one day becoming the owner of the paper. But JOE MARTIN was one young man who was to make this dream come true.)

He got his political start by marching in a torchlight parade for William McKinley in 1896. At the time, a family friend told his father, "Don't let that boy go into politics—he's too good a boy."

JOE, who was otherwise a fellow of extremely good sense, did not listen to this sound advice. Traveling by horse and buggy, he campaigned for the Massachusetts House of Representatives in 1911, and was elected—age 27.

In 1916 he began attending Republican presidential conventions. This would become a habit of more than 50 years' duration. And today he holds the record—unsurpassed in either party—of having been five times the permanent chairman of national conventions.

His gentle humor has broken many tense moments at conventions, as all of us recall who were at San Francisco in 1956 when a Nebraska delegate tried to nominate "Joe Smith" for Vice President.

But not all moments at national conventions are so supercharged. At his first convention, JOE woke up in the middle of the night to find that a poker game was in progress in the hotel room. And to his astonishment, he discovered that the dealer was

none other than the legendary Diamond Jim Brady.

By 1924 JOE was running for Congress, and he's held that office as your Representative ever since.

Those were the days of great orators in the House of Representatives. However, not all Congressmen could keep from wallowing in clichés. JOE remembers that one of the first great speeches he heard began: "I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that politics makes strange bedfellows. Especially since women got into 'em."

JOE was put on the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Of course, he really wanted to be on the Post Office Committee. (But not all freshmen legislators could be that lucky.) Interestingly, at that time the Foreign Affairs Committee spent a full week debating such earth-shaking questions as to whether or not to authorize \$20,000 for an international poultry show in Tulsa.

The new Congressman began to establish his lifetime reputation as a fighter for New England. But he also learned the pitfalls of his office. After getting a new post office for Fall River, it turned out that the building contract went to a firm in St. Louis. The building was constructed not with Fall River granite, but with Indiana limestone. And to top it all off, the job of night watchman was given to the father of JOE's Democratic opponent.

Yet, despite such temporary setbacks, he kept getting reelected to Congress. A dairyman from Taunton once said, "I vote the straight Democratic ticket, except for Congressman MARTIN. I always vote for him because my father told me to, 15 years ago." Indeed, JOE MARTIN had become a vital institution in his district.

Much deserved recognition came often to JOE MARTIN. In 1936 he was chosen Republican national committeeman from Massachusetts. In 1938 he was elected chairman of the national Republican congressional committee. In 1939 he became the Republican leader of the House. In 1940 he was considered a dark horse candidate for the Presidency, and received 44 votes at the convention. Although he never sought the office, this is what the great Kansas editor, William Allen White, said of him: "He will make *** if the dice roll right, a liberty-loving President."

When Wendell Willkie was made the 1940 nominee, he begged JOE to become chairman of the Republican National Committee.

Putting devotion to party above personal wishes, as usual, JOE accepted the post. As chairman he had the rare distinction of seeing the committee evicted from its building when it was purchased by an organization that hasn't been too friendly to most Republicans. However, although he was far from a wealthy man, JOE took over another building and obligated himself as a personal liability for the \$33,000 lease. (Is there any wonder why Republicans love JOE MARTIN?)

The greatest tribute came to JOE MARTIN in 1947 when he was first elected Speaker of the House. Next to the President, as most students of government know, the Speaker is the most powerful elective official in the United States.

But what most people don't know is that besides presiding over the House, the Speaker has a great many other duties, such as supervising a Capitol bank with assets of \$4 million. The Speaker also has responsibility for four barbershops and a beauty parlor. But JOE, as a confirmed bachelor, told a colleague, "I think I'll let you run the beauty parlor. You are more experienced with the women than I am."

This question of experience with the opposite sex was to change rapidly. For under the new law of presidential succession, Speaker MARTIN was first in line if anything

no Vice President when Truman succeeded F.D.R., you will recall.) Of course, the possibility of a bachelor President was a great temptation to the single ladies of this country. JOE MARTIN was deluged with offers of marriage. (One proposal that particularly amused him came from a woman spiritualist in Clarksburg, W. Va., who wrote that the deceased Wendell Willkie had told her to marry JOE.)

There are a great many reasons for JOE MARTIN's success. But I would like to mention just two of them.

The first is his adherence to the old New England principle of thrift. Once JOE MARTIN invited a President of the United States to his office for lunch. He called a caterer for some box lunches and was told that they would cost \$2 apiece. Well, this seemed a bit high to JOE, so he shopped around until he found a man who would provide a box lunch for \$1.19. I am sure that this makes JOE the only man in American history to entertain a President at such a bargain price. And, of course, JOE has always applied this same principle to the taxpayer's dollar.

Second, JOE MARTIN is a very likable person. Even those who are his political opponents have come to have a special place in their hearts for him. For example, there is quite a collection of GOP elephants in JOE's office, and one of the most handsome was given to him by Harry Truman. The story behind this is that someone sent it to the White House, and President Truman told his secretary, "Take this up to JOE MARTIN. I don't want any damned dancing elephants around here."

JOE has served our Nation with great skill. He has been a major force in some of the most crucial decisions of our times. To cite just one instance: During World War II General Marshall came to him and asked for \$1.6 billion to manufacture an atomic bomb. JOE's job would be to try to get this money from Congress, largely on faith—for the greatest secrecy had to be maintained. Thus, to a large extent, JOE MARTIN was responsible for putting through a program that eventually shortened the war and saved millions of American lives.

But speaking to you, in a sense, as a representative of JOE MARTIN's party, I would also like to say a few words about "JOE MARTIN—Republican."

When he was first nominated for House leader in 1939, it was said of him: "We are doing more than electing a floor leader. We are choosing a symbol of the Republican Party."

And JOE MARTIN has been a magnificent symbol of integrity, dedication, honor, and patriotism.

Through the darkest days of Republican Party history, he has played one of the most significant roles in keeping the two-party system alive and functioning.

The dedication of JOE MARTIN's autobiography reads: "To the millions of Republicans—and to the many Democrats and independents as well—who fought with me through the years to maintain the two-party system of government in the United States."

This has been JOE MARTIN's greatest fight. And all Americans, regardless of party, are very much in his debt, and owe him a lasting vote of thanks.

From all of us, JOE MARTIN, thank you from the bottom of our hearts.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

MR. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 109 I am not recorded as voting. I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected accordingly.

THE SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

May 25, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2621

Both sections of our magnificently reunited country sent into their armies men who became soldiers as good as any who ever fought under any flag. Military history records nothing finer than the courage and spirit displayed at such battles as Chickamauga, Antietam, Kenesaw Mountain, and Gettysburg. That America could produce men so valiant and so enduring is a matter for deep and abiding pride.

The same spirit on the part of the people at home supported those soldiers through 4 years of great trial. That a nation which contained hardly more than 30 million people, North and South together, could sustain 600,000 deaths without faltering is a lasting testimonial to something unconquerable in the American spirit. And that a transcending sense of unity and larger common purpose could, in the end, cause the men and women who had suffered so greatly to close ranks once the contest ended and to go on together to build a greater, freer and happier America must be a source of inspiration as long as our country may last.

A philosopher once said that music is to the soul as the wind is to the sail. I have read that more songs and music came out of the Civil War period than from any other war in which Americans have fought. To appreciate the feelings and convictions that prevailed 100 years ago, let us listen to two musical numbers that some believe best represent the respective feelings of North and South in that War Between the States of our Union. The first number, "The Battle Cry of Freedom," recorded for Columbia Records by Richard Bales, was a rallying song reported by Confederate troops to have been sung by Union soldiers during attacks made in the Seven Days' Battles of the Peninsula Campaign. As Union troops charged they would sing at the top of their voices, "Rally around the flag, boys, rally once again."

A few days before his assassination, while being serenaded by the U.S. Army Band on the White House grounds, President Lincoln was asked what he would like to hear. The President replied that his favorite number was "Dixie" and that according to his Adjutant General the song was now Federal property and therefore belonged to all the American people. He requested that the band play "Dixie" for all to enjoy. Let us listen to "Dixie" as an American song.

In a publication entitled "Facts About the Civil War," published by the Civil War Centennial Commission in 1959, President Eisenhower expressed in a letter to the commission his pleasure with the pamphlet as well as with the objective of the centennial observance period. This letter contained in part the following comment which he also was kind enough to tape for occasions such as this.

"I would urge in all our commemorations of the Civil War Centennial, that we look on this great struggle not merely as a set of military operations, but as a period in our history in which the times called for extraordinary degrees of patriotism and heroism on the part of the men and women of both the North and the South. In this context we may derive inspiration from their deeds to renew our dedication to the task which yet confronts us—the furtherance, together with other free nations of the world, of the freedom and dignity of man and the building of a just and lasting peace."

In a biography of John F. Kennedy, 35th President of the United States, William Carr completed his book with a quote from "Profiles in Courage" as expressed by President Kennedy. "The courage of life is often a less dramatic spectacle than the courage of a final moment; but it is not less than a magnificent mixture of triumph and tragedy. A man does what he must—in spite of personal consequences, in spite of pain."

gers and pressures and that is the basis of all human morality."

So it was that Robert E. Lee, member of an old and honored family, whose forebears had played distinguished roles in Virginia and early American history; so it was that this Lee, born in Westmoreland County, Va., later graduated with honors from West Point, first distinguished in the Mexican War, and later renowned as a promising soldier and leader of the future—so it was that Lee did what he felt a "man must"—he turned down an offer from President Lincoln to command the U.S. Army when civil war appeared imminent. Only a few miles from here, in his home in Arlington, now a national shrine, Lee made his fateful decision that was unquestionably based on a matter of principle and deep conviction. For Lee was a man of exemplary character. He believed in God. He did not believe in slavery and freed the slaves that he had inherited. His decision, from every indication, was based on inner conviction and adherence to duty as God gave him the right to see that duty.

This was the same fortitude displayed by President Eisenhower in proudly displaying a picture of General Lee on his White House Office wall and subsequent reply to a critic in these words: "Gen. Robert E. Lee, in my estimation was one of the supremely gifted men produced by our Nation. He believed unwaveringly in the constitutional validity of his cause, which until 1865 was still an arguable question in America; he was a poised and inspiring leader, true to the high trust reposed in him by millions of his fellow citizens; he was thoughtful yet demanding of his officers and men; forbearing with captured enemies but ingenious, unrelenting, and personally courageous in battle, and never disheartened by a reverse or obstacle. Through all his many trials, he remained selfless almost to a fault and unfailing in his faith to God. Taken altogether, he was noble as a leader and as a man, and unsullied as I read the pages of history." And President Eisenhower continued: "From deep conviction I simply say this: A nation of men of Lee's caliber would be unconquerable in spirit and soul. Indeed, to the degree that present-day American youth will strive to emulate his painstaking efforts to help heal the Nation's wounds once the bitter struggle was over, we, in our own time of danger in a divided world, will be strengthened and our love of freedom sustained. Such as the reasons I proudly display this picture of the great Americans on my office wall." Such was the same conviction that has motivated men throughout history to stand for sacred principles. Such is the same conviction that motivates men to volunteer to fight and possibly die in the jungles of confused and strife-torn Republic of Vietnam and wherever the right of free choice is threatened; this is the same conviction that motivates young people today to take a stand, to set a goal and then with stanch determination move to find what can be done for a country in dire need of additional leadership and duty faithfully performed.

Yes, Robert E. Lee, American—did what he felt he must. So it was that Douglas Southall Freeman did what he felt he must—determined that America should never forget, he devoted 20 years in research and study to write three volumes entitled "R. E. Lee" and in those pages, so thoroughly researched by Freeman, emerges the profile not only of courage, but of stamina, of devotion to duty, of love for God and country, of humility, kindness, and benevolence so sorely needed in the world today. Such was the character of the man for whom your school is named.

In Lee there was no mystery or enigma. He did what he believed was right. And I submit to you that we of the faith of our fathers must do today whatever is required.

these perilous times in which we live. We must keep faith with America. We are told that the time may come soon for honorable compromise to prevent a nuclear war and possible destruction of the human race. With this we can agree. For history teaches that the Government of the United States itself is the result of compromise—of each man taking a little less than he wants so that a meeting of minds can result and thus insure reasonable life for all. We should never forget the inaugural advice of our late President John F. Kennedy, "Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate."

Neither should we forget the words spoken last Wednesday night by President Lyndon Johnson, which said in effect, we shall never abandon those nations, however small, that seek our aid to maintain freedom.

So on this day while some predicted 30,000 fellow Americans are gathering at this moment at Appomattox, Va., as I plan to, upon leaving you today, to pay homage to the character of men who "rendezvoused" there 100 years ago, let us remember the challenge left by the noble and gallant Robert E. Lee. Let us especially remember the last 5 years of his life during which he left a heritage and a message that should be echoed by every American. As president of Washington College, now Washington and Lee University, he advised a Southern lady who inquired as to the rearing of her children, "Madam," said Lee, "don't bring up your sons to detest the U.S. Government. Recollect that we form one nation now; abandon your local animosities and make your sons Americans."

Facing the duty of the hour, Lee realized in the last 5 years of his life that the question submitted to the arbitrament of war had been fully answered. He recognized that the unity of the American people had been irrevocably established. He, therefore, promptly counseled his old soldiers to look upon the great country thus reunited by blood and iron as their own and to live and labor for its honor and welfare. His own conduct was in accordance with these teachings. Day-by-day examples illustrated the declaration of his manly words "that human virtue should be equal to human calamity."

Said Lee after the Confederacy had passed into history, "We had sacred principles to maintain and rights to defend for which we were in duty bound to do our best even if we perished in the attempt." I submit to you, we have sacred principles to maintain and rights to defend in the Republic of Vietnam, in Berlin, in Korea, and in all those places wherever freedom exists.

Students of Robert E. Lee High School, you are to be commended for your achievements both in scholastics and in sports. Greater Springfield and surrounding communities are well aware of your successes. You are recognized as one of the great high schools of Virginia and rightly so in keeping with the spirit and character of the man for whom your school is named. But I leave this thought with you and only you can decide on the merit of my suggestion. On Veterans Day, 1962, it was my privilege to speak to the faculty and students of Walter Johnson High School in Montgomery County, Md. As I entered the main corridor of that school my attention was drawn to a large painting of Walter Johnson, a member of Baseball's Hall of Fame. I was greatly impressed by that well-lighted likeness of the school's namesake and the attention it commanded. Later I was equally impressed by an outside marker to Walter Johnson's memory; at the base of which marker I spoke to the students. I shall never forget the spirit of that school. Since the change of the name of your school from Lee to Robert E. Lee, I have often thought—are the students of Robert E. Lee High School fully capitalizing on the name of their school? And even more important—are you emulating the character of

May 25, 1965

Robert E. Lee? Can more be done to channel his traits to thousands who will pass this way? Only you can answer this question. In your hearts you will find the answer.

Firearms Control Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. OLIVA HUOT

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, much discussion has been generated by S. 1592 and H.R. 6628, the controversial firearms control legislation.

I have taken a position in opposition to this legislation on the ground that it was oppressive and unrealistic, particularly that provision of the bill which would absolutely prohibit the purchase of firearms from mail order houses by individuals. I believe this provision would discriminate against gun owners and collectors in smaller cities and rural areas.

Previous legislation introduced in the Congress would permit mail order sales and require the purchaser to register when securing firearms in this manner. I believe this legislation to be beneficial to the general public rather than S. 1592 or H.R. 6628 which flatly prohibits such sales.

Since the introduction of S. 1592 and its House counterpart, my office has been overwhelmed by mail from outraged sportsmen who sought the opportunity to express their opposition to this legislation. For this reason, on May 14, I sponsored a public hearing in Exeter, N.H., on firearms control. Over 300 interested sportsmen attended this hearing to voice their views. Those in attendance presented both their own personal views and the views of organizations to which they belonged. I would like to point out that these people were not unaware of the problems caused by the unregulated traffic in firearms. They were aware of the needs for some regulation to check the sale of firearms to minors and felons. They were, on the other hand, concerned that S. 1592 as written placed undue restrictions on legitimate responsible firearms users. For example, the bill makes no allowances for unserviceable antique weapons. It makes no exceptions for the transportation and sending of weapons to or by law enforcement officers. And, as previously pointed out, it places an absolute embargo on the shipment in interstate commerce of firearms to individuals.

The 300-plus people in attendance at the hearing expressed nearly unanimous opposition to S. 1592 as now drafted. I share this opposition and express the hope that the respective committees charged with the responsibility of dealing with this legislation will see fit to incorporate responsible amendments and revisions which will make this legislation acceptable to legitimate firearms users.

**"On Turning the Other Cheek"—Article
by Dr. Frederick B. Harris**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, our distinguished Chaplain, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, continues to write a very forthright and eloquent column on important principles which should be foremost in the minds of all who are concerned with preserving our American way of life. The Sunday Star of May 23, 1965, published another outstanding article by Dr. Harris; it is entitled "On Turning the Other Cheek."

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**SPRIT OF THE SPIRIT: ON TURNING THE
OTHER CHEEK**

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain,
U.S. Senate)

A certain correspondent has pictured ruthless dictators who, with the godless regimented systems they represent, war against all that makes America other than a cleaner sty. This columnist makes a bid for an appeaser's halo by suggesting, regarding these international bullies, "in spite of all rebuffs and insults, why don't we just turn the other cheek?" In the article there is the implication that such a suicidal policy would be essentially Christian. Here, standing bellicently against all that we steadfastly believe, are tyrants who are the incarnation of brute force and who do not hesitate as do all of their kin, to deceive, to break solemn vows, to plot mischief anywhere across all frontiers, to murder and butcher whenever such tactics further the completion of their diagram of world conquest.

These modern Caesars welcome, as a symptom of weakness, any apparent softness on the part of those who are arraigned against them. Confronting such individuals and the concentration camp systems for which they are the spokesmen, we are advised not to use the hard pebble of truth in the sling of righteousness, making sure it reaches the exposed part of some strutting giant, but to advance against such a foe with no weapon but that of turning one's cheek to take his blows.

Alas, this turning the other cheek technique is at the heart of much of the "peace now" protests which in these days of destiny are coming from church pulpits, from peace-at-any-price pacifists, and from college campuses which prize the same sophistries which brought on World War II. Such vociferous groups chant the demand, "negotiation now." But how utterly true is the burning message of President Johnson, in the midst of the nightmarish days and nights through which we and he, as our leader, are passing that should we agree to a spurious peace in our time, "the future will curse us for losing both the peace and freedom."

True it is that the greatest of all teachers admonished, "If a man smite thee on one cheek, turn to him the other." But remember Christ was talking about some personal affront. If it is a matter between individuals, then turning the other cheek is in the turreth away wrath. But that is by no

means the method Christ advised and practiced when He came face to face with evil whose aim was to desecrate the innate dignity of other people. It must never be forgotten that when the Master fronted evil aimed at other people "He looked 'round about on them with anger." He was utterly unruffled no matter what men did to Him and what lies they told, but when injustice and duplicity and cruelty reached out to maim others who were defenseless, His anger rose to the fury of a tempest. It is crystal clear in any study of the words of Jesus that we are not through with Him when we dwell on his sweetness and light. At times He is tender—at other times He is terrible.

As a keen student of the Christ of the New Testament has put it, "any darkening of the world by cruelty or craft brought His soul to its feet fiery eyed and defiant." Who can read the denunciation of the hypocritical religious leaders of His day without realizing that He is in the presence of a wrath like molten lava. If anyone has no name for the strong Son of God but "Gentle Jesus, meek and mild," and who thus assumes that the Christ-like solution for solving any situation is just for one having been slapped on one cheek to meekly offer the other, such a one must be assured that he is looking at only a partial Christ. To be Christ-like is never to be neutral, placid, or complacent when evil is having its malignant way with individuals or with society.

We are grateful that only a tiny minority of sincere people in these days of destiny dare to suggest that the way to deal with ruthless dictators is to give them a chance at the other cheek. Florence Nightingale did not turn the other cheek when she was assailed by those whose hearts were not moved at the horror of hospitals in her day. A modern biographer of her inspiring career pictures her not just as a gentle lady with a lamp, but as a crusading lady with a lash, with the call of God loud and clear, within her uncomfortable soul pounding and bullying government officials into providing decent treatment for the wounded and the dying.

One of the greatest peace advocates of our generation, Harry Emerson Fosdick, in a stirring hymn has written some striking sentences worthy to be written on the protesting banners of millions who could be mobilized to surround the White House, backing the President and the Congress, determined to save both the peace and the freedom. On each banner there ought to be inscribed, "negotiation without strength is surrender." Underneath that could be appropriately put some of Fosdick's lines which do not suggest turning the other cheek. This, for instance—"Save us from weak resignation to the evils we deplore." And this—

"Gird our lives that they may be armored with all Christ-like graces,
In the fight to set men free.
Grant us wisdom,
Grant us courage,
That we fall not man nor Thee."

Joe Martin Testimonial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most moving tributes ever paid to a Member of this body was rendered to our beloved former Speaker, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachu-

May 25, 1969

In his commencement address, Senator ANDERSON challenged Alaskans to take their full part in the development of their State. He said that a bright future of trade with the East and in the exportation of natural resources lies before Alaska. I agree.

Before I ask unanimous consent to have Senator ANDERSON's remarks printed in the RECORD, I wish to call attention to another person who received a degree at the same commencement exercises: The university awarded a doctor of science degree to Max Brewer, the head of Arctic research, and founder of Orlin II, an ice island which just completed a 3-year voyage across the Arctic Ocean. Men and instruments on the drifting ice island were gathering priceless information about the Arctic Ocean—information which will help unlock the mysteries of the Arctic and will help make available great sources of untapped natural resources, for the benefit of all.

The university chose wisely in honoring two men who have done much for Alaska and for their country.

I ask unanimous consent to have the commencement address by the senior Senator from New Mexico printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FULL PARTNER FOR PROGRESS

(Commencement address by Senator CLINTON F. ANDERSON, University of Alaska, May 24, 1965)

It is a pleasure to be back in Alaska. I appreciate your many kindnesses to me and Mrs. Anderson whenever we have visited you. You may have cold hands but you have warm hearts and I thank you for your courtesies.

During the hearings on Alaska statehood and in the months following the earthquake, I visited Alaska enough to begin to feel like a real sourdough instead of a mere cheechako.

We have been through a lot—you and I—since the March 27 earthquake, fire, and flood. We have worked and worried and argued as the massive job of reconstruction got underway and steps were taken to insure that the State's economy could respond to the immense demands placed upon it. We sought to guarantee that if tax revenues fell short because of the severe blow to your economy, the State's government would receive the revenues it needed to provide the services required of it. At last, a year later, we can say that the economy has been pulled to its feet. The State government is not only alive, but kicking. Reconstruction has been financed and it is well underway. Alaska—as a State and as a people—took the worst that nature could throw at it—and survived. Now there can be no doubt in any mind that the State of Alaska will endure as long as the Union endures—and that means into the limitless future.

Reconstruction, this great effort, has been remarkable for two things: the cooperation that made it possible, the efficiency that made it work. We are indebted to President Johnson for both.

In the dark days after the disaster, it was the President who determined that reconstruction must be a joint effort of the State and the Federal governments, a full partnership. To bring this about, he created by executive order, the Federal Reconstruction and Planning Commission for Alaska which together with State authorities administered the programming and expenditures of the rebuilding. When the President picked

the members of that Commission and your Gov. Bill Egan appointed Joe Fitzgerald to represent your State, a partnership was struck that never faltered.

It was the President, too, who directed the Federal agencies involved in the reconstruction to cut red tape and to speed every action. With my appointment as Chairman, he gave me the authority to see that this was done. There are many civil servants, here and in Washington, who know that when the Commission said, "Do this," it meant, "Do it now." There are many in the Congress who know that when the President said, "I want this for Alaska," he wanted it now.

As a result, on the first anniversary of the earthquake, the Federal Government had committed over \$322 million to the job. Of this amount, close to \$150 million was in the form of outright grants, \$82 million for the replacement and repair of Federal installations, and \$61 million in long-term low-interest loans to Alaska businessmen and homeowners.

And as a further result, unemployment is down, construction is up, production is back to normal and the economy is back in business.

The recovery of south central Alaska is of importance in itself; it is also important to Alaska as a whole, for a body with a diseased member is not a healthy body. This is as true in economics as it is in medicine. And this truth is as important to Fairbanks as it is to Anchorage. Without regard to the earthquake, there are still too many sections of Alaska that do not have a healthy economy. Too many communities are in a depressed state relying upon industries which are dying or dead and gone. Too many of Alaska's communities are dependent totally and literally for their daily bread upon decisions made far away in the Pentagon.

It is, in many ways, a cruel hoax that history has played upon Alaska. Here it is, the State of the last frontier, a true and vital and promising frontier; yet too often instead of lively independence, Alaskans are tied to decisions made outside. Instead of a bright and venturesome development of vast untapped resources, Alaskans too often are caught in the dying agonies of gold mining and the inefficiency of canneries with antiquated equipment, fishing boats with outmoded gear. Alaskans too often live with a haphazard, sporadic economy supported by irregular injections of Federal money.

If we are ever to have a prosperous Alaska, it must be the whole of the sum of its healthy parts. Alaska needs, in other words, an integrated and coherent economic system. Only planning and the continued cooperation of the governments concerned can bring this about. The President recognized this when, as the reconstruction effort came to a close, he proclaimed the formation of the Federal Development Planning Committees for Alaska. These two committees, one in Washington and one in Alaska, designed to insure the full cooperation between the Federal executive branch and the State of Alaska's Development Planning Committees and thereby make clear, once and for all, that the Federal Government has a particular and permanent interest in the economic growth and sound development of Alaska and that it shares this interest jointly with the State government. This recognition of interdependence is an important step which the Federal Government has taken. Important not only for the future welfare of Alaska, but important for the promise it brings the whole country of benefits flowing from Alaska in the form of resource development and increased tax revenues.

That there is a Federal responsibility and a joint interest in Alaska's future has been recognized by the President and the Congress. There is time to talk about what this will mean as the work of the Committee proceeds.

But for this day and this occasion, I would like to point out what it does not mean. It does not mean that the Congress has given Alaska a blank check. It does not mean that the Federal Government is going to pay Alaska's way. There is a special relationship, but there is not a special license.

As the record of this Congress has made clear, the Congress will pay its share but Alaska must share in every endeavor.

The Federal Planning Committees are now in operation, and the able Joe Fitzgerald is chairman of the field committee. This committee—sure to be invaluable to the future of your State—is unique in the history of our country. Here a joint Federal, State, local effort must be made to coordinate all economic developments in a State: to see that the capital invested in this State is invested in as efficient and productive a manner as possible, in accordance with the overall and long-range economic development needs of the State. The mission of this committee is exciting; the potential of its work seems unlimited. Such a concept places heavy burdens on the quality of the leadership in Alaska and thus, in turn, upon the quality of education which your university provides.

The field committee must make the studies, coordinate the development and recommend the programs which will give encouragement and direction to the State and its growth. The field committee is here in Alaska and it is Alaska that will provide its leadership. The Federal Government will provide the support but the State must lead the way.

Now I must admit that I have heard some good-natured grumbling here in Fairbanks as citizens survey the reconstruction and new building that is going on in Anchorage and throughout the earthquake belt. I have even heard it said that some feel that perhaps a little earthquake for Fairbanks—with a resultant inflow of SBA loans and OEP reconstruction money—would not come amiss. But Fairbanks need not worry. It has something far better than an earthquake here in its university.

In the long run, the University of Alaska will be more important to central Alaska, indeed to all Alaska, and fully as productive, fully as income generating as any quake. An active university generates new ideas, creates leadership, and produces the excitement, controversy, and confidence which are more powerful than any earthquake, more far reaching than any tidal wave.

To me, if you will excuse an outsider for offering an opinion, the mission of your university—in the heart of Alaska, on the edge of the Arctic and the rim of North Pacific—is threefold:

1. The university has a responsibility to the State to provide the studies and develop the talent needed by business and government if growth is to proceed.

2. The university has a responsibility to central Alaska to provide the cultural atmosphere, the intellectual yeast and the economic benefits which a great university can bring.

3. The university has a responsibility to itself. It should respond to and take full advantage of the special scientific and cultural challenges presented by its location at the gateway to the Arctic and the keystone of the Pacific.

The university is a land-grant college and is a living example of Federal-State cooperation. Mining and mineral studies here are equal in quality to any in the world. Biology and life sciences are well represented. The university's geophysical institute, supported largely by Federal funds, explores the outer atmosphere and the phenomena of space and earth.

The university's laboratory of forest research studies the control of foliage-eating pests and disastrous forest fires so that the

May 25, 1965

harvest from more than 160 million acres of forest in inland Alaska may be brought some day to market. The new water pollution laboratory is almost complete, the Arctic Health Research Center Laboratory is underway and I would not be surprised to have the years ahead bring to the campus centers of radiation and air pollution studies. The university operates the Naval Arctic Research Laboratory at Point Barrow and soon will be in cooperation with the European Space Research Organization Tracking Station to be built outside of Fairbanks.

The university, with its scientific capability, especially in the fields of biology and arctic sciences, is making use of the opportunity which its location presents. While Russia and the Scandinavian countries bordering the Arctic Ocean have long been engaged in such study, the United States has been slow to apprehend the significance and the promise of arctic and subarctic lands under our flag. I am confident that in the years ahead this university will make clear to the world its preeminence in arctic scientific studies.

There are, however, other aspects of the Arctic which could also be profitably studied. The Arctic is rich in resources—and they are untapped. Is there a way to develop them economically? Can new and better mining practices be developed for the exploitation of the resources of the North? Are there practical means of transporting bulk commodities at reasonable prices across the roadless tundra? Can more work be done on easing the physiological and psychological demands made upon man by arctic climates? These are things that a great University of the North should study.

We know that Japan and the Far East lie in Alaska's future. Alaska's resources and the needs of the highly industrialized East must, and in due course will, come together. Pacific trade, growing by great leaps from year to year, will profit Alaska immensely as her fish, metals, timber, and fuels—both coal and oil—go to market. The University of Alaska should encourage these developments. It has need of a capability in Eastern languages, history, and sociology. There should be exchange programs with students and teachers from oriental universities. Alaska businessmen need to know how Eastern businessmen act and think. They need to know about Eastern culture as well as Eastern business so that Alaskans, in the years ahead, will be as comfortable in Tokyo as they are in San Francisco. In this regard, I am pleased to hear that the university will have next year a history institute sponsored by NDEA funds to study the history of Russia in America—a haunting but little known episode—and the equally little known history of the northern Pacific. These are things that an alert university halfway between the Far East and the Far West may claim as its special field.

And through tourism, a rising industry which you must nurture, closer ties will be cemented with the South 48. The marine highway—the ferry system, financed wholly by Alaskans—will bring a host of tourists in their cars up the Inside Passage. While this, of course, is largely a seasonal affair, it will be an important element in the State's economy as travel increases and transportation facilities improve.

In the days after the earthquake we learned that to share the wealth we must share the work. We learned that Federal and State Governments harnessed in partnership with business and industry can do more for Alaska together than each can do separately. We learned the need of leadership—leadership that must come from within the State. The development of this leadership and the provision of the technical and cultural services it needs will mold and make the mission of the University of Alaska.

The future of the State of Alaska depends upon the continued development of its natural resources and the promotion of its cultural and educational institutions.

But I have watched you at work, and liked what I saw.

I have no fear for the future of Alaska.

SUPPORT OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF THE FIREARMS ACT

MR. TYDINGS. Mr. President, recently I have received a great deal of mail in opposition to Senate bill 1592, to amend the Firearms Act. I wish to explain, for the RECORD, why I support this bill.

My primary reason for cosponsoring the bill is that we need effective controls on the movement of firearms in interstate commerce. Too often these firearms find their way to juveniles, the mentally ill, drug addicts, habitual criminals, and other unstable persons who may misuse them.

Every year, hundreds of our citizens are killed by weapons in the hands of irresponsible persons. Tightened firearms regulations will, in my opinion, prevent many needless tragedies. All of us know that Lee Harvey Oswald shot President Kennedy with a gun which Oswald purchased through a mail-order catalog. Had there been effective controls on the distribution of firearms, Oswald might not have been able to buy a gun, and President Kennedy might not have been killed.

The bill does not, however, restrict legitimate ownership and possession of firearms. It would simply terminate interstate mail-order traffic of firearms, and would prohibit over-the-counter sale of firearms to person under 21 years of age, except that shotguns and rifles could be sold over the counter to persons 18 years of age or above.

I am acutely aware of the enormous volume of mail in opposition to this proposed legislation. I am persuaded, however, that many of the opponents of this bill are misinformed concerning its provisions. The bill would not hinder the importation or sale of firearms for lawful, sporting purposes, or the importation of antique and unserviceable firearms. Gun collectors and sportsmen need have no fear that this bill will hamper their leisure activity. If I were to find that any provision of the bill would cause unnecessary hardship to responsible sportsmen or collectors, I would support an amendment to correct the bill.

The public should clearly understand that:

Nothing in this bill would prevent a citizen from purchasing a gun at any sporting-goods store or hardware store in his State.

Nothing in the bill would prevent any citizen from taking a gun or pistol across State lines for a lawful purpose.

Nothing in the bill would prevent or restrict the sale and distribution of guns in every State by reputable licensed dealers.

I, too, am a hunter and a somewhat inexpert skeet and trap shooter, and I possess firearms for this purpose. Indeed, almost as long ago as I can remember, I accompanied my father to the duckblinds, and learned to shoot his double-barreled shotgun. I intend to give my son the same training. This bill will not restrict the possession or use of my sporting guns.

The licensing fees provided for by the bill relate to dealers, manufacturers, and importers, not to individual purchasers and owners. These fees are designed to insure that no person shall be permitted to import firearms or ammunition, or to manufacture or deal in these items unless he is a legitimate, reputable dealer, manufacturer, or importer.

Under this proposed legislation, various abuses in the existing Federal Firearms Act licensing system would be eliminated. The hazards and dangers of free-flowing mail-order traffic in firearms would be reduced.

With our ever-increasing crime rate, and with statistics showing that an extremely high percentage of crime is committed by persons bearing firearms, I feel this legislation is very much needed.

POPULATION GROWTH REPORT

MR. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the National Academy of Sciences today released the first report of its Permanent Committee on Population Problems. The report, entitled "The Growth of U.S. Population," surveys the major problems in this area, and presents the committee's conclusions and recommendations for further action.

All of the recommendations would be furthered and the solution of the problem would be aided by early enactment of Senate bill 1673, which would create Assistant Secretaries of State and of Health, Education, and Welfare for population problems.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the conclusions set forth on pages 22 to 25 of the report entitled "The Growth of U.S. Population."

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCLUSIONS

The freedom to limit family size to the number of children wanted when they are wanted is, in our view, a basic human right. The evidence cited in this report shows clearly that most Americans of higher income and better education exercise this right as a matter of course, but that many of the poor and uneducated are in effect deprived of the right. No family should be fated through poverty or ignorance to have children they do not want and cannot properly care for. Responsible parenthood requires that couples of all social strata have the ability and means to limit births when they wish to do so, in accordance with their personal convictions. In short, this basic freedom for the individual family should be made effective throughout American society.

We are glad to note several important developments in this field since the Academy's 1963 report. The President's pledge in his state of the Union message, that he "will seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population and the growing scarcity in world resources," was an enlightened and statesmanlike response to the present situation. The new policy of the Agency for International Development to provide assistance in family planning at the request of foreign governments is a welcome step forward. The recent statement of the American Medical Association, quoted above, shows that the leaders of the medical profession recognize the broad responsibilities that American physicians share in educating their patients in fertility control. The 1964 statement of